

iCAHE JC Critical Appraisal Summary

Journal Club Details

Date of submission	April 2012
Journal Club location	FMC (SP)
JC Facilitator	Elizabeth Perre
JC Discipline	Speech Pathology

Article/Paper

Skoretz S, Flowers H & Martino R (2010) The incidence of dysphagia following endotracheal intubation: A systematic review, *Chest*, 137; 665-673.

Please note: due to copyright regulations CAHE is unable to supply a copy of the critically appraised paper/article. If you are an employee of the South Australian government you can obtain a copy of articles from the [DOHSA librarian](#).

Article Methodology:	Systematic Review
Returned JC on:	April 2012
By CAHE staff member:	Namita M



CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 karen.grimmer-somers
 @unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

Ques No.	Yes	Can't Tell	No	Comments
1	✓			<p>Did the review ask a clearly-focused question? Yes. The main objectives of the review were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To find the incidence of dysphagia after intubation in patients To check the association between dysphagia and duration of endotracheal intubation To evaluate patient characteristics associated with dysphagia. <p><i>Population</i> – studies including adults (>18years) having reported absence or presence of oropharyngeal dysphagia following intubation during hospitalization were included.</p>
2	✓			<p>Did the review include the right type of study? The review included a total of 14 studies and 11 were prospective studies consisting of two randomised trials, three cohort studies, one case control and five case series. The remaining three were retrospective studies including two case series and one cohort study design.</p> <p>Is it worth continuing? YES the studies which have been looked at are relevant in addressing the study aims.</p>
3	✓			<p>Did the reviewers try to identify all relevant studies? A total of 14 electronic databases were searched. Manual searching for relevant citations in 20 journals between 1988 to may 2009 was carried out. Citations were also reviewed from accepted articles. Finally grey literature and conference proceedings were also searched as well.</p>
4	✓			<p>Did the reviewers assess the quality of the included studies? Quality and risk assessment of the included studies was assessed using the risk bias assessment tool and grading of recommendations, assessment development and evaluation.</p>

CONTACTS

www.unisa.edu.au/cahe
 karen.grimmer-somers
 @unisa.edu.au
 Telephone (08) 8302 2769
 Facsimile (08) 8302 2766

University of South Australia
 GPO Box 2471
 Adelaide SA 5001
 Australia

CRICOS Provider Number
 001218



iCAHE

University of South Australia | International Centre for Allied Health Evidence

A member of the Sansom Institute

5			✓	<p>If the results of the studies have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?</p> <p>No meta analysis was done due to the heterogeneity of the studies in the review.</p>
6				<p>How are the results presented and what is the main result?</p> <p>Due to the heterogeneity between study methodologies, outcomes, patient diagnosis in the included studies the results were reported descriptively.</p> <p>Main results-</p> <p>According to most of the studies in the review increased frequency of dysphagia was seen in patients with longer duration of intubation.</p> <p>Implications for clinical practice</p> <p>Swallowing assessments should be carried out in patients undergoing prolonged intubation</p> <p>Implications for research</p> <p>Higher quality studies using homogenous populations should be carried out in future to assess the effect of prolonged intubation.</p>
7				<p>How precise are these results?</p> <p>No statistical evaluation of the studies was done due to heterogeneity. Hence no effect sizes could be calculated</p>
8			✓	<p>Can the results be applied to the local population?</p> <p>As the studies had small sample size and were low quality study designs more research is needed with high quality study designs in future.</p>
9	✓			<p>Were all important outcomes considered?</p> <p>The studies used swallowing impairment as their main outcome. This was defined differently in the included studies like as dysphagia severity or as aspiration or as swallowing latency.</p>
10				<p>Should policy or practice change as a result of the evidence contained in this review?</p> <p>Journal club to answer.</p>